

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

JOE ANDREW SALAZAR,

Plaintiff,

v.

HTC CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 2:16-cv-01096-JRG-RSP

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
PATENT CASE**

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF JOE ANDREW SALAZAR'S SECOND MOTION TO
COMPEL DEFENDANT HTC CORPORATION TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S
ORDER AND PRODUCE 30(B)(6) WITNESS AND GRANTING HTC
CORPORATION'S CROSS-MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND TO TERMINATE THE
DEPOSITION UNDER RULE 30(D)(2)-(3)**

On this date, the Court considered the briefing on Plaintiff's Second Motion to Compel Defendant HTC Corporation to Comply with the Court's Order and Produce 30(b)(6) Witness and HTC Corporation's Cross-Motion for Sanctions and to Terminate the Deposition Under Rule 30(D)(2)-(3).

After considering the Motions and the response thereto, the Court is of the opinion that Plaintiff's Second Motion to Compel HTC Corporation to Comply with the Court's Order and Produce 30(b)(6) Witness should be DENIED. It is further ORDERED that the deposition should be terminated and HTC Corporation is awarded its fees incurred in responding to Plaintiff's Second Motion to Compel Defendant HTC Corporation to Comply with the Court's Order and Produce 30(b)(6) Witness and its fees and costs incurred in preparing for, traveling to, and defending the March 29 Rule 30(b)(6) deposition.

Therefore, it is ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion is DENIED and Defendant's Motion is GRANTED.